DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 574 SP 033 347

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE Preservice Teacher Evaluation: An Analysis of the Variance.
PUB DATE Aug 91
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Analysis of Variance; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Research; Higher Education; *Minimum Competencies; *Preservice Teacher Education; Rating Scales; *Statistical Significance; *Student Teacher Evaluation; Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors
IDENTIFIERS Washburn University of Topeka KS

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the degree of variance which exists among different groups of evaluators relative to their assessments of the teaching competencies demonstrated by preservice education students. Participants in the study were 75 undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University's (Kansas) teacher preparation program during the spring and fall of 1990. Data were obtained from 102 cooperating teachers and 84 university supervisors regarding 25 competencies as perceived through the application of rating scales. Data analysis revealed three significant levels of difference for the respective groups of evaluators. The greatest level of differences occurred with respect to measuring the competency related to student teachers' ability to use appropriate resources for the development of lessons. Next were the significant differences regarding the assessments made concerning the student teachers' ability to develop appropriate evaluation devices. The third level was found relative to the student teachers' ability to choose appropriate strategies for teaching. The bulk of the document (58 pages) consists of 4 appendixes: (1) Tables 1-25--The Mean Standard Deviation; (2) Tables 26-50--The Analysis of Variance: Multiple Comparisons Using Fisher's LSD Matrix of Probabilities; (3) Table 51--Summary Table Listing Levels of Significance; and (4) the Evaluative Instruments. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PRESERVICE TEACHER EVALUATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE VARIANCE

ED338574

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AUGUST 15, 1991

SP 033 347

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 3

Problem Statement 3

Research Design 4

The Mean, Standard Deviation and Analysis of Variance . . 5

The Level of Significance 5

Conclusion. 7

Appencix A. 8

Tables 1-25

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Appendix B. 34

Tables 26-50

The Analysis of Variance

Multiple Comparisons: Fisher's LSD

A Matrix of Probabilities

Appendix C. 60

Table 51

Summary Table Listing Levels of Significance

Appendix D. 63

The Evaluative Instruments

PRESERVICE TEACHER EVALUATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE VARIANCE

This study of preservice student teachers involved a population of 41 (n = 41) undergraduates certified to teach by Washburn University's teacher preparation program during Spring Semester of 1990 and 34 (n = 34) undergraduates during the Fall of 1990 for a total of 75 (N = 75) undergraduates. Data were obtained from the cooperating teacher(s) (n = 55, Spring 1990 and n = 47, Fall 1990) and the evaluations of the university supervisors (n = 43, Spring 1990 and n = 41, Fall 1990) regarding the competencies as perceived through the application of the same measuring instrument.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of variance found existing among the above different groups of evaluators relative to their assessments of the teaching competencies demonstrated by preservice teacher education students. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What does the application of the analysis of variance show relative to the performance of the student teachers when measured with the same rating scale by their respective cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor(s)?
2. Are there any significant differences between the respective evaluations of these same student

teachers by the cooperating teachers and university supervisors relative to the same competencies?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency (Appendix D).

At the end of student teaching, the cooperating teacher, and university supervisor completed the rating scale containing the same criteria related to the teaching-learning process. The data were obtained from the above and tabulated and analyzed on the computer. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) lists the numbers on the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. In addition, the respondents were to check NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the number of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations relative to

each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean, Standard Deviation, and Analysis of Variance

Tables 1 through 25 (Appendix A) show the mean scores and standard deviations for the twenty-five competencies related to teaching as represented by the Spring, 1990 and Fall, 1990 student teachers. Mean scores were obtained in regards to the perceptions of the competencies demonstrated by the student teachers. Tables 26-50 (Appendix B) illustrate the multiple comparisons of the above groups of evaluators as provided through the application of the analysis of variance by using Fisher's levels of significant differences (LSD). A matrix of probabilities was obtained for each competency through the multiple comparisons provided in Fisher's LSD relative to the above groups of evaluators assessing the competence of the Spring 1990 and Fall 1990 student teachers.

The Level of Significance

Since a (p) value between 0.05 is usually thought of as marginally significant, anything greater was labeled in this study as a nonsignificant difference. Tables 26 through 50 (Appendix B) show the matrix of probabilities illustrated through the application of Fisher's multiple comparisons for each of the mean scores of Spring semester

1990 and Fall Semester 1990, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. The variability which occurred within this study was depicted through taking into account the size and location of each individual score in terms of each respective mean score derived from the groups of respondents. Table 51 (Appendix C) lists the differences found among and within the various mean scores. Comparisons were made of the most significant values derived relative to each of the twenty five competencies. It can readily be noticed that the assessments of the specific competencies in the student teachers by the groups of evaluators were significantly different in only three instances. Thus, no significant differences were derived from the different groups of evaluators in twenty-two of the twenty-five comparisons. The three instances of significant differences were at or below the .05 level.

Conclusion

The mean values derived from the application of the rating scale by the cooperating teachers and university supervisors relative to the student teachers' ability to demonstrate competencies related to the teaching-learning process were in most instances not significantly different. However, three significant levels of difference were found below the .05 level of significance for the respective groups of evaluators.

The greatest level of differences occurred relative to measuring the competency related to using appropriate resources for the development of lessons (e.g. .01) Next were the significant differences regarding the assessments made concerning the student teachers' ability to develop appropriate evaluation devices (e.g. 02). A third level of significance was found relative to the student teachers' ability to choose appropriate strategies for teaching (e.g. .04).

The above differences occurred while rating the student teachers on twenty-five competencies. There were no significant differences found among the cooperating teachers and university supervisors when each group rated the student teachers on the other twenty-two competencies.

APPENDIX A
TABLES 1-25
THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

TABLE 1

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 1-PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	0	0	0	1
2	0	1	0	0
3	3	2	1	3
4	11	8	7	4
5	40	35	30	31
Competent				
NA	1	0	5	2
Mean	4.69	4.67	4.76	4.64
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.67	0.49	0.84

TABLE 2

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 2-MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	1	0	0	1
2	3	1	0	0
3	3	6	3	2
4	13	6	8	9
5	35	34	32	29
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.42	4.55	4.67	4.59
Standard Deviation	0.96	0.80	0.61	0.81

TABLE 3

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 3-CONFIDENCE IN ABILITY TO TEACH

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	3	1	0	0
3	6	3	2	2
4	15	17	19	15
5	31	25	21	23
Competent				
NA	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.35	4.36	4.45	4.44
Standard Deviation	0.89	0.87	0.59	0.81

TABLE 4

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 4-MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	3	0	0	1
2	1	2	1	0
3	2	1	0	2
4	12	9	7	9
5	37	35	34	29
Competent				
NA	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.44	4.64	4.76	4.59
Standard Deviation	1.05	0.74	0.58	0.81

TABLE 5

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 5-COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN CLASSROOM

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	1	1	0	1
2	3	1	1	0
3	4	4	1	2
4	21	22	17	9
5	24	19	23	29
Competent				
NA	2	0	1	0
Mean	4.21	4.21	4.48	4.59
Standard				
Deviation	0.95	0.86	0.67	0.81

TABLE 6

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 6-PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	1	0
3	0	0	0	2
4	4	4	3	4
5	15	14	3	22
Competent				
NA	36	28	36	13
Mean	4.79	4.67	4.14	4.71
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.77	0.60	0.60

TABLE 7

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 7-REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	0	2	0	1
2	3	0	0	0
3	2	4	1	0
4	10	6	9	6
5	40	35	32	34
Competent				
NA	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.58	4.53	4.74	4.76
Standard				
Deviation	0.81	0.97	0.50	0.70

TABLE 8

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 8-PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	0	0	0	1
2	1	2	1	1
3	3	4	1	1
4	5	4	3	2
5	46	37	37	34
Competent				
NA	0	0	1	2
Mean	4.75	4.62	4.81	4.72
Standard				
Deviation	0.64	0.82	0.59	0.86

TABLE 9

PART A-PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 9-PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	1	0	0
2	1	0	0	1
3	2	0	0	0
4	6	7	7	5
5	40	34	32	30
Competent				
NA	6	5	4	5
Mean	4.73	4.74	4.82	4.78
Standard Deviation	0.64	0.70	0.39	0.59

TABLE 10

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 10-USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	0	2	0	1
2	1	0	0	0
3	4	0	2	2
4	13	15	14	12
5	37	30	27	26
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.56	4.51	4.58	4.51
Standard				
Deviation	0.71	0.88	0.59	0.90

TABLE 11

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 11-DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	1	0	0	1
2	2	2	1	0
3	6	5	3	5
4	21	11	14	10
5	25	28	24	24
Competent				
NA	0	1	1	1
Mean	4.22	4.41	4.45	4.40
Standard Deviation	0.92	0.86	0.74	0.90

TABLE 12

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 12-DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	2	1	0	0
3	5	8	3	5
4	15	9	14	8
5	33	27	26	27
Competent				
NA	0	1	0	0
Mean	4.44	4.30	4.53	4.46
Standard				
Deviation	0.81	0.99	0.63	0.90

TABLE 13

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 13-OBTAIN APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	1	1	0	0
3	2	1	2	3
4	15	11	15	9
5	37	33	26	26
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	2
Mean	4.60	4.57	4.56	4.51
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.83	0.59	0.85

TABLE 14

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 14-CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	1	1	1	0
3	7	6	2	5
4	16	13	20	13
5	31	26	20	22
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.40	4.32	4.37	4.34
Standard Deviation	0.78	0.93	0.69	0.88

TABLE 15

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 15-PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	3	1	1	0
3	3	3	19	3
4	19	18	22	13
5	30	24		24
Competent				
NA	0	0	1	0
Mean	4.38	4.34	4.50	4.44
Standard				
Deviation	0.83	0.87	0.55	0.84

TABLE 16

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 16-MANAGES CLASSROOM FACILITIES EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	1	1	0	1
2	1	2	0	0
3	5	2	1	2
4	17	17	14	11
5	31	25	28	27
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.38	4.34	4.63	4.54
Standard				
Deviation	0.87	0.92	0.54	0.81

TABLE 17

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 17-MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	2	1	0	0
2	2	1	3	1
3	8	8	0	6
4	23	17	21	15
5	20	20	10	19
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.04	4.15	4.30	4.27
Standard				
Deviation	1.00	0.93	0.80	0.81

TABLE 18

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 18-DEVELOP APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	0	1	0	0
3	8	2	3	4
4	12	19	14	15
5	31	20	25	21
Competent				
NA	4	4	1	0
Mean	4.45	4.30	4.52	4.34
Standard				
Deviation	0.76	0.86	0.63	0.85

TABLE 19

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 19-ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N-43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	3	1	0	0
3	6	0	3	3
4	17	22	12	9
5	28	21	28	26
Competent				
NA	1	2	0	2
Mean	4.30	4.36	4.58	4.51
Standard Deviation	0.88	0.80	0.63	0.85

TABLE 20

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 20-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	1	0	1
2	0	1	0	0
3	5	2	1	0
4	9	3	8	8
5	27	27	19	23
Competent				
NA	14	13	15	9
Mean	4.54	4.59	4.64	4.63
Standard Deviation	0.71	0.96	0.56	0.79

TABLE 21

PART B-INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 21-WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	0	0	1
2	0	2	0	0
3	7	3	0	1
4	14	9	10	11
5	23	25	24	18
Competent				
NA	11	8	9	10
Mean	4.36	4.46	4.71	4.45
Standard Deviation	0.75	0.85	0.46	0.85

TABLE 22

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 22-DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

Incom-	Cooperating		University	
petent	Teachers		Supervisors	
	Sp. 90	Fall 90	Sp. 90	Fall 90
	N=55	N=47	N=43	N=41
1	4	2	0	1
2	1	0	1	0
3	3	3	3	2
4	14	9	8	7
5	33	33	31	31
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	0
Mean	4.29	4.51	4.60	4.63
Standard Deviation	1.15	0.95	0.73	0.80

TABLE 23

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 23-COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	1	0	0	1
2	1	1	0	0
3	1	1	3	1
4	17	14	9	13
5	25	26	28	21
Competent				
NA	10	5	3	5
Mean	4.42	4.55	4.63	4.47
Standard Deviation	0.84	0.67	0.63	0.81

TABLE 24

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 24-COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	0	0	1
2	1	1	1	0
3	4	1	1	1
4	5	9	5	6
5	44	36	35	31
Competent				
NA	1	0	1	2
Mean	4.70	4.70	4.76	4.69
Standard Deviation	0.69	0.62	0.62	0.77

TABLE 25

PART C-INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

QUESTION 25-MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL, OPEN MINDEDNESS, FLEXIBILITY

Incom-	Cooperating Teachers		University Supervisors	
petent	Sp. 90 N=55	Fall 90 N=47	Sp. 90 N=43	Fall 90 N=41
1	0	0	0	1
2	0	1	0	0
3	4	4	0	3
4	11	6	6	2
5	40	36	37	34
Competent				
NA	0	0	0	1
Mean	4.65	4.64	4.86	4.70
Standard Deviation	0.62	0.74	0.35	0.82

APPENDIX B
TABLES 26-50
THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: MULTIPLE COMPARISONS USING FISHER'S LSD
MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES

TABLE 26

PRACTICES PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.139
University Supervisors	*.139	1.000

*p< .139 or .14 level of significance

TABLE 27

MAINTAINS ENTHUSIASM FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.846
University Supervisors	*.846	1.000

*p< .846 or .85 level of significance

TABLE 28

CONFIDENCE IN THE ABILITY TO TEACH

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.00	1.000
University Supervisors	1.000	1.000

*p< 1.000 level of significance

TABLE 29

MAINTAINS PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.928
University Supervisors	*.928	1.000

*p< .928 or .93 level of significance

TABLE 30

COMMUNICATES EFFECTIVELY IN THE CLASSROOM

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.818
University Supervisors	*.818	1.000

*p< .818 or .82 level of significance

TABLE 31

PARTICIPATES IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.531
University Supervisors	*.531	1.000

*p< .531 or .53 level of significance

TABLE 32

REQUESTS, ACCEPTS, AND PROFITS FROM SUGGESTIONS MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.916
University Supervisors	*.916	1.000

*p< .916 or .92 level of significance

TABLE 33

PRACTICES PUNCTUALITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.132
University Supervisors	*.132	1.000

*p< .132 or .13 level of significance

TABLE 34

PARTICIPATES IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.771
University Supervisors	*.771	1.000

*p< .771 or .77 level of significance

TABLE 35

USES APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LESSONS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.005
University Supervisors	*.005	1.000

*p< .005 or .01 level of significance

TABLE 36

DETERMINES STUDENT NEEDS AND INTERESTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.579
University Supervisors	*.579	1.000

*p< .579 or .58 level of significance

TABLE 37

DEVELOPS LONG-RANGE AND DAILY PLANS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.317
University Supervisors	*.317	1.000

*p< .317 or .32 level of significance

TABLE 38

OBTAINS APPROPRIATE RESOURCES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.330
University Supervisors	*.330	1.000

*p< .330 or .33 level of significance

TABLE 39

CHOOSES APPROPRIATE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.038
University Supervisors	*.038	1.000

*p< .038 or .04 level of significance

TABLE 40

PRESENTS LESSONS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.560
University Supervisors	*.560	1.000

*p< .560 or .56 level of significance

TABLE 41

MANAGES CLASSROOMS EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.704
University Supervisors	*.704	1.000

*p< .704 or .70 level of significance

TABLE 42

MANAGES CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR EFFECTIVELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.788
University Supervisors	*.788	1.000

*p< .788 or .79 level of significance

TABLE 43

DEVELOPS APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DEVICES

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.016
University Supervisors	*.016	1.000

*p< .016 or .02 level of significance

TABLE 44

ASSESSES AND INTERPRETS STUDENT PROGRESS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	*1.000	*1.000
University Supervisors	*1.000	*1.000

*p< 1.000 level of significance

TABLE 45

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH STUDENTS FROM VARIOUS CULTURES MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO FALL 1989 AND SPRING 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.726
University Supervisors	*.726	1.000

*p< .726 or .73 level of significance

TABLE 46

WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.672
University Supervisors	*.672	1.000

*p< .672 or .67 level of significance

TABLE 47

DEVELOPS RAPPORT WITH STUDENTS

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.497
University Supervisors	*.497	1.000

*p< .497 or .50 level of significance

TABLE 48

COUNSELS STUDENTS APPROPRIATELY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	.895
University Supervisors	*.895	1.000

*p< .895 or .90 level of significance

TABLE 49

COOPERATES WITH ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.315
University Supervisors	*.315	1.000

*p< .315 or .32 level of significance

TABLE 50

MAINTAINS APPROPRIATE PERSONAL BEHAVIOR, SELF-CONTROL OPEN-MINDEDNESS, AND FLEXIBILITY

MULTIPLE COMPARISONS: FISHER'S LSD - A MATRIX OF PROBABILITIES RELATIVE TO SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Cooperating Teachers	1.000	*.484
University Supervisors	*.484	1.000

*p< .484 or .48 level of significance

APPENDIX C
TABLE 51
SUMMARY TABLE LISTING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

TABLE 51

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance
Practices Professional Ethics	.14
Maintains Enthusiasm	.85
Confidence in Ability	1.00
Professional Appearance	.93
Communicates Effectively	.82
Professional Organizations	1.00
Profits from Suggestions	.92
Practices Punctuality	.13
School Activities	.77
Resources for Development	.01
Determines Student Needs	.58
Develops Lesson Plans	.32
Resources for Teaching	.33
Strategies for Teaching	.04
Presents Lesson Effectively	.56
Manages Classroom Facilities	.70
Manages Classroom Behavior	.79
Develops Evaluation Devices	.02
Assesses Student Progress	1.00
Works with Various Cultures	.73

TABLE 51 CONTINUED

SUMMARY SHOWING LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR VARIANCE AMONG EVALUATORS OF SPRING 1990 AND FALL 1990 STUDENT TEACHERS

Competency Evaluated	Level of Significance
Works with Exceptional Students	.67
Develops Rapport	.50
Counsels Students Effectively	.90
Cooperates with School	.32
Personal Behavior	.48

APPENDIX D
THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____Semester_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Confidence in ability to teach	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Maintain professional appearance	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Communicate effectively in classroom	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Participate in professional organization	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions	___	___	___	___	___	___
8. Practice punctuality	___	___	___	___	___	___
9. Participate in school activities	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons	___	___	___	___	___	___
11. Determine student needs and interests	___	___	___	___	___	___
12. Develop long-range and daily plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching	___	___	___	___	___	___
15. Present lessons effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively	___	___	___	___	___	___
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices	___	___	___	___	___	___
19. Assess and interpret student progress	___	___	___	___	___	___
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures	___	___	___	___	___	___
21. Work effectively with exceptional students	___	___	___	___	___	___
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students	___	___	___	___	___	___
23. Counsel students appropriately	___	___	___	___	___	___
24. Cooperate with all school personnel	___	___	___	___	___	___
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

_____
Cooperating Teacher

WASHBURN UNIVERSITY
FOLLOW-UP PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Name_____School District_____Building_____
Assignment: Subject_____Grade Level_____Semester_____
University Supervisor_____Supervising Teacher_____

Directions: Rate the student teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

A. Professional Competence	1	2	3	4	5	NA
1. Practice professional ethics						
2. Maintain enthusiasm for teaching						
3. Confidence in ability to teach						
4. Maintain professional appearance						
5. Communicate effectively in classroom						
6. Participate in professional organization						
7. Request, accept, and profit from suggestions						
8. Practice punctuality						
9. Participate in school activities						
B. Instructional Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
10. Use appropriate resources for development of lessons						
11. Determine student needs and interests						
12. Develop long-range and daily plans						
13. Obtain appropriate resources for teaching						
14. Choose appropriate strategies for teaching						
15. Present lessons effectively						
16. Manage classroom facilities effectively						
17. Manage classroom behavior effectively						
18. Develop appropriate evaluation devices						
19. Assess and interpret student progress						
20. Work effectively with students from various cultures						
21. Work effectively with exceptional students						
C. Interpersonal Competence	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
22. Develop rapport with students						
23. Counsel students appropriately						
24. Cooperate with all school personnel						
25. Maintain appropriate personal behavior, self control, open-mindedness, flexibility, etc.						

Comments:

_____
University Supervisor

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Educational
Research and Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed
March 17, 1992